

Force, curvature, or mass: disambiguating causes of uniform gravity

Yuan Shi*

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California 94551, USA

(Dated: November 12, 2021)

In addition to Newtonian forces and spacetime curvature, gradients of the Higgs vacuum expectation value (VEV), which can be induced by the presence of matter, also lead to particle acceleration and photon redshift. Here, I compare distinct effects of force, curvature, and Higgs VEV gradient that cause uniform acceleration. In particular, I show that a spurious stress-energy tensor is required if the acceleration is in fact due to the Higgs VEV gradient but is falsely attributed to spacetime curvature. On cosmological scales, the spurious density coincides with the observed dark energy density and may contribute to the Hubble tension; on galactic scales, the inferred dark matter density falls within expectation and may explain the lopsidedness of galaxy spectrographs; and on the Earth scale, the spurious density is minuscule. The experimental precision required to disambiguate causes of the Earth's gravity is estimated. Laboratory tests are challenging but possible.

Einstein's theory of general relativity (GR) interprets gravity as spacetime curvature [1–3]. Constructed to recover Newtonian gravity in the weak-field limit, GR is initially supported by three additional evidences: gravitational redshift of photons [4–8], perihelion procession of Mercury [9–13], and gravitational lensing of light [14–19]. After almost a century, other predictions of GR have finally been confirmed, owing to recent detection of gravitational waves [20, 21] and an image of a black hole [22]. The classical GR would be complete if it were not due to outstanding difficulties on large scales [23–25], which have motivated alternative theories [26–28]. Most notably, the standard cosmology model requires $\sim 68\%$ dark energy and $\sim 27\%$ dark matter [29–32], which have so far evaded laboratory detection [33].

While the geometry that enters the Einstein's equation is classical, matter that curves the spacetime is quantum. At low energy, quantum matter gravitates because of its mass, and in the Standard Model, elementary particles acquire their masses through the Higgs mechanism [34]. Although nucleons, which dominate the mass of ordinary matter, are composite particles whose masses are more subtle [35–38], dimensionful scales are ultimately set by elementary particles. For example, the scale can be set by the pion decay constant, which is related, through electroweak processes, to the mass of W bosons.

It is important to recognize that the Higgs VEV, and therefore the masses of all particles, can be altered by ambient matter. The simplest argument can perhaps be made via the toy Lagrangian ($\hbar = c = 1$ unless specified):

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\psi}i\cancel{\partial}\psi - f\phi\bar{\psi}\psi + \frac{1}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2}u^2\phi^2 - \frac{\lambda}{4!}\phi^4, \quad (1)$$

where the Dirac fermion ψ couples with the real scalar ϕ via the Yukawa coupling f . Once ϕ acquires a VEV, the fermion gains a mass term $m = f\langle\phi\rangle$. Moreover, the VEV is depleted by the presence of a nonperturbative amount of matter that dominates antimatter:

$$\langle\phi\rangle = 2\sqrt{\frac{2u^2}{\lambda}} \cos \frac{\pi - \theta}{3} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{6u^2}{\lambda}} - \frac{f\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle}{2u^2}, \quad (2)$$




FIG. 1. Uniform gravity due to force (a), frame acceleration (b), and Higgs VEV gradient (c) can be disambiguated using a second test particle (red, “1”) with different initial conditions, in addition to a prototypical particle (grey, “0”) that has constant a_0 . For Newtonian forces (a), $a_1 = a_0$. In general relativity (b), a_1 is usually not a constant. For mass gradient (c), a_1 usually differs from a_0 but is a constant.

where $\cos \theta = 3\sqrt{\lambda/2}f\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle/(2u^3)$. The VEV given by Eq. (2) is not the global minimum, but it gives a positive fermion mass and is stable as long as $\cos \theta < 1$. Near this local minimum, the Higgs field acquires a mass $M^2 = u^2[4\cos^2\frac{1}{3}(\pi - \theta) - 1] \simeq 2u^2 - \sqrt{3\lambda/2}f\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle/u$. The Higgs mass vanishes when $\theta = 0$, at which the local minimum is lost. There, the density $\rho = f\langle\phi\rangle\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ attains the critical value $\rho_c = 4u^4/(3\lambda) = \langle\phi\rangle_0^2 M_0^2/9$, where “0” denotes the vacuum case. For the Higgs field [33], $\langle\phi\rangle_0 \approx 246$ GeV and $M_0 \approx 125$ GeV, so $\rho_c \approx 2.4 \times 10^{28}$ kg \cdot m $^{-3}$. We see matter effects are small even at nuclear density. Beyond this toy model, ϕ is an SU(2) doublet, and $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ has spacetime dependencies. Nevertheless, the key ingredient of the argument remains effective.

A spacetime-dependent Higgs VEV is analogous to a density gradient in refractive media (Fig. 1). As first noted by Anderson [39, 40], photons become massive particles in plasmas, whose dispersion relation $\omega^2 = \omega_p^2 + c^2k^2$ allows one to identify the plasma frequency $\omega_p = \sqrt{e^2n_0/\epsilon_0m_e}$ as the photon mass. When the plasma density n_0 is nonuniform, refraction occurs, which mimics effects of gravity [41]. However, if one is unaware of the plasma, then the bending of light rays would require some spurious forces or spacetime curvature to explain.

To quantify the effects, let us focus on a classical particle, namely, the geometric-optics approximation of a quantum wave packet. The classical trajectory $x^\mu(\tau)$ on a prescribed background field is described by the action

$$\int d\tau \left(\frac{1}{2} m \dot{x}^\mu g_{\mu\nu} \dot{x}^\nu + e \dot{x}^\mu A_\mu \right), \quad (3)$$

where $g_{\mu\nu}$ is the metric tensor and A_μ is the electromagnetic gauge 1-form. Notice that while $g_{\mu\nu}$ and m can have spacetime dependencies, the charge e must be a constant due to gauge symmetry.

The geodesics, or classical trajectories, are obtained by extremizing the action. The resultant equation is

$$\ddot{x}^\alpha + (\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha + S_{\mu\nu}^\alpha) \dot{x}^\mu \dot{x}^\nu = \frac{e}{m} g^{\alpha\mu} F_{\mu\nu} \dot{x}^\nu, \quad (4)$$

where $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ is the usual Christoffel symbol and $F_{\mu\nu}$ is the electromagnetic tensor. The extra term due to the Higgs VEV gradient is

$$S_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \frac{1}{2\langle\phi\rangle} \left(\delta_\mu^\alpha \langle\phi\rangle_{,\nu} + \delta_\nu^\alpha \langle\phi\rangle_{,\mu} - g_{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\sigma} \langle\phi\rangle_{,\sigma} \right), \quad (5)$$

where commas denote partial derivatives. Since $F_{\mu\nu} = -F_{\nu\mu}$, Eq. (4) implies that $H = m \dot{x}^\mu g_{\mu\nu} \dot{x}^\nu$ is a constant.

That the Yukawa coupling does not enter has the important implication that $S_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ is universal. In other words, the motion of all massive particles are equally affected by Higgs VEV gradients. On the other hand, light-like geodesics are not affected by the conformally flat $S_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$. This is intuitive, because photons have no direct coupling with the Higgs field. Mathematically, after Weyl rescaling [42], a spacetime-dependent mass may be absorbed by redefining the metric to be $(mg)_{\mu\nu}$. Then, $(mg)^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu}/m$, and the Christoffel symbol $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha[mg] = \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha[g] + S_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$. However, the role played by $g_{\mu\nu}$, which is dimensionless, is physically distinct from the role played by the Higgs VEV, which is dimensionful. In fact, $\langle\phi\rangle$ plays a similar role as the scalar gravity of Nordström [43], which predates GR and is later incorporated into the gravitation theory of Ni and Yang [44, 45].

A spacetime-dependent mass mimics effects of a curved metric. Quantitatively, the metric connection defined by $(mg)_{\mu\nu}$ gives rise to a Riemann curvature tensor $R_{\nu\alpha\beta}^\mu[mg] = R_{\nu\alpha\beta}^\mu[g] + C_{\nu\alpha\beta}^\mu + r_{\nu\alpha\beta}^\mu$, where $C_{\nu\alpha\beta}^\mu = \Gamma_{\alpha\sigma}^\mu S_{\nu\beta}^\sigma + S_{\alpha\sigma}^\mu \Gamma_{\nu\beta}^\sigma - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta)$ and $r_{\nu\alpha\beta}^\mu = S_{\nu\beta,\alpha}^\mu + S_{\alpha\sigma}^\mu S_{\nu\beta}^\sigma - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta)$. What is of importance to GR is the Ricci curvature tensor, to which the Higgs VEV contributes

$$r_{\mu\nu} = \frac{3\langle\phi\rangle_{,\mu}\langle\phi\rangle_{,\nu}}{2\langle\phi\rangle^2} - \frac{\langle\phi\rangle_{,\mu\nu}}{\langle\phi\rangle} - \frac{1}{2\langle\phi\rangle} \partial_\alpha \left(g_{\mu\nu} g^{\alpha\beta} \langle\phi\rangle_{,\beta} \right). \quad (6)$$

Notice that $r_{\mu\nu}$ can be nonzero even when $g_{\mu\nu}$ is trivial. In other words, this effective curvature has little to do with the intrinsic geometry of spacetime, and it arises only because one tries to interpret the Higgs VEV using a geometric language.

To illustrate the central idea, let us consider the conceptually important, albeit not realistic, case of uniform acceleration. A particle is undergoing uniform acceleration if its acceleration is a constant in the particle's instantaneous rest frame [46]. When observed in the lab frame, uniform acceleration translates to the condition $\gamma^3 d^2\mathbf{x}/dt^2 = \mathbf{a}$, where γ is the Lorentz factor and \mathbf{a} is a constant. Suppose \mathbf{a} is along the z axis, then by symmetry, there exist a coordinate system, which I will refer to as the lab frame, where the action is of the form $\int d\tau [\frac{1}{2} m (U^2 \dot{t}^2 - V^2 \dot{z}^2 - \dot{x}^2 - \dot{y}^2) - e E_0 z \dot{t}]$, where m , U , and V only depends on z , and E_0 is a constant electric field, whose effect is identical to that of a Newtonian gravitational field. Then, the equation of motion (EOM) in x , y , and t directions can be easily integrated to give $m\dot{x} = p_x$, $m\dot{y} = p_y$, and $mU^2 \dot{t} - eE_0 z = p_t$, where p_x , p_y , and p_t are three additional constants of motion. Substituting these into the EOM in the z direction,

$$\left(\frac{dz}{dt} \right)^2 = \frac{U^2}{V^2} \left[1 - \left(\frac{U}{p_t + eE_0 z} \right)^2 (Hm + p_x^2 + p_y^2) \right]. \quad (7)$$

This equation locally determines a unique geodesics for a given set of initial conditions. In what follows, I will focus on the special case where the motion is along the z direction, for which $p_x = p_y = 0$. The initial conditions at $\tau = 0$ are $t = 0$, $z = z_1$, $\dot{t} = \gamma_1$, and $\dot{z} = \gamma_1 \beta_1$. Then, the nontrivial constants of motion are $p_t = m_1 \gamma_1 U_1^2 - eE_0 z_1$ and $H = m_1 \gamma_1^2 (U_1^2 - \beta_1^2 V_1^2)$, where m_1 denotes $m(z)$ evaluated at z_1 and so on.

Before discussing the general case where force, curvature, and mass are simultaneously at play, it is helpful to consider their effects individually. First, in the case of uniform force, $U = V = 1$ and $m = m_0$ is a constant (Fig. 2, dotted). For time-like geodesics, $\gamma_1^2 (1 - \beta_1^2) = 1$, and Eq. (7) becomes $(dz/dt)^2 = 1 - 1/[\gamma_1 + a_E^0 (z - z_1)]^2$. The trajectory is hyperbolic:

$$[a_E^0 (z - z_1) + \gamma_1]^2 - (a_E^0 t + \gamma_1 \beta_1)^2 = 1, \quad (8)$$

where $a_E^0 = eE_0/m_0$ is the bare acceleration due to a constant force field.

Second, let us consider uniform gravity in GR, which is indistinguishable from a uniform frame acceleration according to the equivalence principle. In this case, $E_0 = 0$, $m = m_0$, and the spacetime is trivial. Nonzero components of the Christoffel symbol are $\Gamma_{tz}^t = U'/U$, $\Gamma_{zz}^z = V'/V$, and $\Gamma_{tt}^z = UV'/V^2$, where the prime denotes the derivative with respect to z . Components of the Riemann curvature tensor are either zero or proportional to $R_{zzt}^t = U''/U - U'V'/(UV)$. For uniform gravity, the spacetime is Ricci flat, for which $V \propto U'$. As is well noted by Rohrlich [47], this condition does not uniquely determine the metric.

The metric can nevertheless be fixed by imposing coordinate conditions. A unique metric exist, which satisfies both conditions (i) the trajectory of a prototypical test

particle with $z_1 = 0$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_0$ is hyperbolic, and (ii) the metric asymptotes to $U \simeq 1 - a_G^0 z$ and $V \simeq 1$ when $z \rightarrow 0$. Here, a_G^0 is the uniform frame acceleration, and I have used the sign convention that the gravitational potential is lower for larger z . This unique metric is

$$U = \frac{\cosh w_0}{\cosh \bar{w}}, \quad V = \frac{\cosh w_0 \sinh \bar{w}}{\tanh w \cosh^2 \bar{w}}, \quad (9)$$

where $\cosh w_0 = \gamma_0$, $\bar{w} = \sinh w - \sinh w_0 + w_0$, and $\cosh w = a_G^0 z + \cosh w_0$. This change of variable is invertible only when $\bar{w} > w_0 - \sinh w_0$ and $a_G^0 z > 1 - \cosh w_0$.

The metric can be trivialized by the coordinate transformation $(t, z) \rightarrow (\tilde{t}, \tilde{z})$ with

$$a_G^0 \tilde{t} = U(z) \sinh(a_G^0 t + w_0) - \sinh w_0, \quad (10)$$

$$a_G^0 \tilde{z} = \cosh w_0 - U(z) \cosh(a_G^0 t + w_0). \quad (11)$$

The metric tensor \tilde{g} then becomes the Minkowski metric. Moreover, the trajectory of the prototypical test particle is $\tilde{z} = 0$. In other words, the tilde coordinate defines the free-fall frame of the prototypical test particle. Notice that Eqs. (10) and (11) become a Lorentz boost when $a_G^0 \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, when a_G^0 is nonzero, the coordinate transform does not cover the entire spacetime. For the lab origin, the Rindler horizon is located at

$$a_G^0 (\tilde{z} + c\tilde{t}) = \cosh w_0 - \sinh w_0. \quad (12)$$

The accelerating lab observer will never see any particle crosses the horizon nor receive any photon beyond the horizon, even though the spacetime is trivial.

Given the flat metric, the geodesics (Fig. 2, solid) are straight lines in the free-fall frame. In the lab frame, Eq. (7) becomes $d\bar{w}/dt = a_G^0 \sqrt{\cosh^2 \bar{w} - \epsilon_1} / \sinh \bar{w}$, where $\epsilon_1 = \cosh^2 \bar{w}_1 - \beta_1^2 \sinh^2 \bar{w}_1 / \tanh^2 w_1$ is given by initial conditions. When $\epsilon_1 > 0$, the trajectory is

$$\cosh \bar{w} = \sqrt{\epsilon_1} \cosh(a_G^0 t + \theta_1), \quad (13)$$

where $\cosh \theta_1 = \cosh \bar{w}_1 / \sqrt{\epsilon_1}$. This is a time-like geodesic $\tilde{z} = \tilde{z}_1 + \tilde{\beta}_1 \tilde{t}$, where $a_G^0 \tilde{z}_1 = (\cosh \bar{w}_1 - \cosh w_0) / [\sqrt{\epsilon_1} \cosh(\theta_1 - w_0)]$ and $\tilde{\beta}_1 = \tanh(\theta_1 - w_0)$. The geodesics become light-like when $\epsilon_1 = 0$, and space-like when $\epsilon_1 < 0$, whose equations can be found similarly.

Unlike the case of a constant force, uniform gravity in GR has a peculiar feature: the motion of a test particle is hyperbolic if and only if its initial conditions satisfy $\beta_1 = \tanh w_1$. Apart from this one-parameter family, other test particles do not experience a uniform acceleration, even through the gravity is presumably uniform. This peculiar feature can be traced back to Eqs. (10) and (11). On the other hand, any fixed point in the lab frame undergoes uniform acceleration in the free-fall frame, except that the acceleration a_G^0/U_1 depends on z_1 .

Third, having discussed well-established causes of uniform acceleration, let us consider effects of the Higgs VEV gradient by setting $U = V = 1$ and $E_0 = 0$. Then,

Eq. (7) becomes $(dz/dt)^2 = 1 - m/(m_1 \gamma_1^2)$. For the prototypical test particle to undergo hyperbolic motion,

$$\langle \phi \rangle = \langle \phi \rangle_0 \left(1 + \frac{a_M^0 z}{\gamma_0} \right)^{-2}, \quad (14)$$

where a_M^0 is the bare acceleration due to the Higgs VEV gradient. As expected, $\langle \phi \rangle$ is depleted in the direction of gravity. Although $\langle \phi \rangle$ blows up at $z = -\gamma_0/a_M^0$, it only needs to take the form of Eq. (14) in the vicinity of $z \sim 0$, and the Higgs VEV can safely level off far above the ground without being noticed by the lab observer.

Given the form of the Higgs VEV, the trajectories (Fig. 2, dashed) are always hyperbolic:

$$(a_M^0 z + \gamma_0)^2 - (a_M^0 t + \kappa_1 \gamma_1 \beta_1)^2 = \kappa_1^2, \quad (15)$$

where $\kappa_1 = (a_M^0 z_1 + \gamma_0)/\gamma_1$. This is similar to the case of a uniform force, except that now the uniform acceleration $a_M^1 = a_M^0/\kappa_1$ depends on initial conditions.

In addition to causing particle acceleration, a Higgs VEV gradient also causes gravitational redshift even when the spacetime is trivial. In one scenario, we can measure the photon frequency using an atomic clock, whose rate is proportional to the Rydberg energy $R_y = m_e e^4 / (8\epsilon_0^2 \hbar^2)$. Alternatively, we can measure the photon wavelength using a grating, whose size is proportional to the Bohr radius $a_B = 4\pi\epsilon_0 \hbar^2 / (m_e e^2)$. Since the mass becomes larger at higher gravitational potential, where the clock ticks faster and the ruler spans shorter, a photon appears to change color when measured at different altitudes. Notice that $d^2 z/dt^2 = -\langle \phi \rangle' / (2\gamma^2 \langle \phi \rangle)$, so a_M^1 equals to the redshift acceleration only for a one-parameter family of initial conditions.

If the uniform acceleration in the form of Eq. (15) is attributed to spacetime curvature, then spurious dark matter or dark energy is required in the Einstein's equation. Denoting $\langle \phi \rangle = \langle \phi \rangle_0 e^\zeta$, which is not necessarily caused




FIG. 2. Example trajectories in lab frame (a) and free-fall frame (b) due to uniform force (dotted), frame acceleration (solid), and Higgs VEV gradient (dashed). For the prototypical particle (blue), these causes are indistinguishable. However, for a test particle with $z_1 = 0$ but $\beta_1 = 5\beta_0 = 0.5$ (orange), or $\beta_1 = \beta_0$ but $z_1 a/c^2 = 3$ (green), the trajectories are different. The dashed gray line is the Rindler horizon.

by the presence of any matter, nonzero components of $S_{\mu\nu}^\alpha$ are $S_{zt}^t = S_{zx}^x = S_{zy}^y = S_{zt}^z = S_{zz}^z = -S_{xx}^z = -S_{yy}^z = \zeta'/2$. Then, components of the effective Riemann tensor are either zero or proportional to $r_{zzt}^t = r_{zzx}^x = r_{zzy}^y = \zeta''/2$ and $r_{txt}^x = r_{tyt}^y = r_{yyx}^x = \zeta'^2/4$. The effective Ricci tensor is diagonal, with $r_{tt} = -r_{xx} = -r_{yy} = (\zeta'' + \zeta'^2)/2$ and $r_{zz} = -3\zeta''/2$. The effective Ricci scalar is then $r = 3(\zeta'' + \zeta'^2/2)$. If we enforce the Einstein's equation $r_{\mu\nu} - rg_{\mu\nu}/2 - \Lambda_0 g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G t_{\mu\nu}$, where G is the gravitational constant and Λ_0 is the bare value of the cosmological constant, then, the spurious stress-energy tensor $t_{\mu\nu}$ takes the form of an ideal anisotropic fluid. The energy density ρ and the perpendicular pressure p_\perp are $\rho = -p_\perp = (\frac{3}{4}\langle\phi\rangle'^2/\langle\phi\rangle^2 - \langle\phi\rangle''/\langle\phi\rangle - \Lambda_0)/(8\pi G)$, and the parallel pressure is $p_\parallel = (\frac{3}{4}\langle\phi\rangle'^2/\langle\phi\rangle^2 + \Lambda_0)/(8\pi G)$. In the special case of uniform gravity [Eq. (14)], $t_{\mu\nu} = \rho g_{\mu\nu}$ takes the vacuum form, where $\rho = -[\Lambda_0 + 3(a_M^0)^2/(\gamma_0 + a_M^0 z)^2]/(8\pi G)$ cannot be produced by ordinary matter.

Depending on the value of Λ_0 , the spurious fluid corresponds to either dark energy or dark matter. Moreover, when $\Lambda_0 < 0$, $\rho(z)$ changes sign: the spurious fluid changes from dark matter to dark energy along the direction of the gravity. The characteristic scale is

$$\rho_s = \frac{(a_M^0)^2}{8\pi G c^2}, \quad (16)$$

where $a_M^0/c^2 \sim \langle\phi\rangle'/\langle\phi\rangle$ is determined by the gradient scale length of the Higgs VEV, whereas $\langle\phi\rangle$ may contribute separately to the vacuum energy density.

On cosmological scales, the expansion of the universe is associated with $a_M^0 \sim -cqH$, where $q \approx -0.55$ is the deceleration parameter and $H \approx 70 \text{ km} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \cdot \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ is the Hubble parameter. Then, $\rho_s \sim 10^{-27} \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$ coincides with the observed dark energy density. The key point here is that cosmological redshifts likely contain contributions from $\langle\phi\rangle$, which is more depleted by the higher matter density along the past light cone. This additional redshift may contribute to the Hubble tension [48].

For galaxies, if we take $a_M^0 \sim (150 \text{ km} \cdot \text{s}^{-1})^2/(10 \text{ kpc})$ to be the orbiting acceleration, then $\rho_s \sim 10^{-29} \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$. To estimate an upper bound, take $\langle\phi\rangle/\langle\phi\rangle' \sim 3 \text{ kpc}$ to be the typical galactic density scale length, then $\rho_s \sim 10^{-14} \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$. The observed dark matter density falls within the above estimates. The depletion of $\langle\phi\rangle$ by matter in the galaxy creates a mass barrier that may contribute to the confinement of gases and stars.

Near the surface of Earth, the gravity is approximately uniform. We can take $a_M^0 = a_\oplus \approx 9.8 \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2}$, then $\rho_s \sim 10^{-7} \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-3}$, which is hardly noticeable in comparison to the density of ordinary matter.

Next, let's consider how to disambiguate causes of uniform gravity when force, curvature, and mass all contribute. In this case, Eq. (7) can be integrated numerically, whereby a_G^0 and a_M^0 can be determined by fitting trajectories of test particles. For contained laboratory tests on Earth, since $az_1/c^2 \sim 10^{-15}(z_1/10 \text{ m})$ and

$\beta_1^2 \sim 10^{-15}(v_1/10 \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1})^2$ are minuscule, it is sufficient to Taylor expand the solution. To leading order in time, $z \simeq z_1 + v_1 t + \frac{1}{2}(a_E + a_G + a_M)t^2 + O(t^3)$, where

$$a_E = \frac{a_E^0}{\gamma_1} \left(1 + \frac{a_M^0 z_1}{\gamma_0}\right)^2 \frac{\bar{C}_1^2}{\gamma_0^2} \left(\frac{T_1^2}{\bar{T}_1^2} - \beta_1^2\right), \quad (17)$$

$$a_G = a_G^0 \left[\frac{T_1}{\bar{T}_1} + \beta_1^2 \left(\frac{1}{S_1^2 C_1} - \frac{1}{T_1 \bar{T}_1}\right)\right], \quad (18)$$

$$a_M = \frac{a_M^0}{\gamma_0 + a_M^0 z_1} \left(\frac{T_1^2}{\bar{T}_1^2} - \beta_1^2\right). \quad (19)$$

Here, $\bar{C}_1 := \cosh \bar{w}_1$, $T_1 := \tanh w_1$, $S_1 := \sinh w_1$, and so on. For the above expansion, we only need Eq. (9) for $g_{\mu\nu}$ and Eq. (14) for $\langle\phi\rangle$ near $z_1 \sim 0$, keeping in mind that they are probably not good approximations of the Earth's gravity. Notice that although the gravity is presumably uniform, the accelerations have gradients.

Unlike usual tests of the equivalence of free fall, where different test particles have comparable initial conditions [48–51], here it is crucial that their initial conditions are distinct. In other words, although the free fall is universal for all particles, their identical acceleration does depend on the initial height and velocity.

In one scenario, we can launch particles with different β_1 from $z_1 = 0$. Denoting $a_0 = a_G^0 + a_M^0/\gamma_0$, the acceleration at $\beta_1 = 0$, then the residual acceleration is

$$a_r \simeq \left(\frac{a_0}{2} - b_0\right)\beta_1^2 - \frac{3a_0}{8}\beta_1^4 + \dots, \quad (20)$$

when we set $a_E^0 = -a_0$. Here, $b_0 = a_G^0/[\gamma_0(1 + \gamma_0)]$ is due to GR. When the uniform gravity is entirely due to GR (Fig. 3a, red), we have $a_0 = 2b_0$ if $\gamma_0 = 1$. Then, $a_r \simeq -3.7 \times 10^{-24} \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2} (a_G^0/a_\oplus) v_{300}^4$, where $v_{300} = v_1/(300 \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1})$. On the other hand, if the uniform gravity is entirely due to the Higgs VEV gradient (Fig. 3a, blue), $a_r \simeq 4.9 \times 10^{-12} \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2} (a_M^0/a_\oplus) v_{300}^2$. These two extreme cases scale differently with β_1 and are of opposite signs.

In another scenario, we can suspend test particles with $\beta_1 = 0$ at different heights z_1 . Suppose an electric field is setup to cancel the leading gradient of the Earth's gravity using some *a priori* geophysical knowledge, then the residual acceleration

$$a_r \simeq -\frac{z_1}{c^2} [3a_0^2 - (2a_0 + b_0)a_G^0 + (1 + \frac{\delta_{0,\beta_0}}{6})(a_G^0)^2]. \quad (21)$$

Notice that a_r is not continuous when $\beta_0 \rightarrow 0$, at which $\bar{w}'(z)$ becomes singular at $z = 0$. Suppose $\gamma_0 = 1$, then $a_r \simeq -1.8 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2} (a_G^0/a_\oplus)^2 (z_1/10 \text{ m})$ in pure GR (Fig. 3b, red). In contrast, if the uniform gravity is entirely caused by the Higgs VEV (Fig. 3b, blue), then $a_r \simeq -3.2 \times 10^{-14} \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-2} (a_M^0/a_\oplus)^2 (z_1/10 \text{ m})$. The negative gradient means weaker gravity closer to ground, which is opposite to the Earth's gradient due to its spherical shape. If one suspends a reference particle, another




FIG. 3. Exact [solid, Eqs.(17)-(19)] and approximate [dashed, Eqs. (20) and (21)] residual acceleration a_r when initial position $z_1 = 0$ (a) and velocity $\beta_1 = 0$ (b), after an electric field is applied to cancel the acceleration at $z_1 = 0$ and $\beta_1 = 0$, assuming $\beta_0 = 0$. In Newtonian gravity, a_r is always zero. When GR [Eqs. (9)] and Higgs VEV [Eq. (14)] each contributes +50% of the uniform gravity (black), a_r lies between the extreme cases of pure GR (red, $a_G^0 = a_{\oplus}$) and pure Higgs VEV gradient (blue, $a_M^0 = a_{\oplus}$). Causes of gravity may therefore be disambiguated by measuring the residual acceleration.

test particle separated by $z_1 = 10$ m will displace by $\Delta z_1 \sim -0.1$ mm after $t \sim 1$ day accumulation.

In the two scenarios discussed above, the electric field is instrumental for removing leading terms of the acceleration to make the small discrepancies more discernible. Other experimental tests, such as matter-wave interferometry [52–54], can also be envisioned, but the stringent precision required is comparable.

Alternatively, one can directly test gravitational redshifts using a clock whose frequency is $\propto m$ or a ruler whose length is $\propto m^{-1}$. For example, using a plasma oscillator, the clock frequency is $\propto m^{-1/2}$, provided that the plasma density, which introduces a separate dimensional scale, is maintained. The Higgs VEV will then cause a blueshift on the GR redshift background.

Finally, the depletion of the Higgs VEV by matter may already be evidenced by distortions of galaxy spectralgraphs. For a given spectral line, a radial (r) mass shifts compound with azimuthal (θ) Doppler shifts to give $\Delta f = f(r)[\beta_s + \beta_{\theta}(r) \sin \iota \cos \theta]$, where $c\beta_s$ is the mean velocity of the galaxy whose inclination is ι . Lopsidedness of this type have been observed while not satisfactorily explained for $> 50\%$ galaxies [55–64].

In summary, nonconstant Higgs VEV can mimic some but not all aspects of GR, and may explain, at least in part, the observed dark energy, dark matter, Hubble tension, and lopsidedness of galaxy spectrographs. Discrepancies between GR and Higgs VEV effects, albeit minuscule on Earth, may be used to disambiguate causes of gravity, which may involve both mechanisms.

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344 and was supported by the Lawrence Fellowship through LLNL-LDRD Program under Project No. 19-ERD-038.

* shi9@llnl.gov

- [1] A. Einstein and M. Grossmann, *Entwurf einer verallgemeinerten Relativitätstheorie und einer Theorie der Gravitation* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1913).
- [2] A. Einstein, Die Feldgleichungen der Gravitation, *Sitzungsber. Königl. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 844 (1915).
- [3] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (Princeton University Press, 2017).
- [4] A. Einstein, Über den Einfluß der Schwerkraft auf die Ausbreitung des Lichtes, *Annalen der Physik* **35**, 898 (1911).
- [5] R. V. Pound and G. A. Rebka, Apparent Weight of Photons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **4**, 337 (1960).
- [6] R. F. C. Vessot, M. W. Levine, E. M. Mattison, E. L. Blomberg, T. E. Hoffman, G. U. Nystrom, B. F. Farrel, R. Decher, P. B. Eby, C. R. Baugher, J. W. Watts, D. L. Teuber, and F. D. Wills, Test of Relativistic Gravitation with a Space-Borne Hydrogen Maser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 2081 (1980).
- [7] H. Müller, A. Peters, and S. Chu, A precision measurement of the gravitational redshift by the interference of matter waves, *Nature* **463**, 926 (2010).
- [8] C. W. Chou, D. B. Hume, T. Rosenband, and D. J. Wineland, Optical Clocks and Relativity, *Science* **329**, 1630 (2010).
- [9] S. Newcomb, Tables of the four inner planets, in *Astronomical Papers prepared for the use of the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac*, Vol. 6 (Washington: Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, 1898) 2nd ed.
- [10] E. Freudlich, Über die Erklärung der Anomalien im PlanetenSystem durch die Gravitationswirkung interplanetarer Massen, *Astronomische Nachrichten* **201**, 49 (1915).
- [11] A. Einstein, Erklärung der Perihelbewegung des Merkur aus der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie, *Sitzungsber. Königl. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 831 (1915).
- [12] K. Schwarzschild, Über das Gravitationsfeld eines Massenpunktes nach der Einsteinschen Theorie, *Sitzungsber. Königl. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 189 (1916).
- [13] X. X. Newhall, E. M. Standish, Jr., and J. G. Williams, DE 102: a numerically integrated ephemeris of the moon and planets spanning forty-four centuries, *Astron. Astrophys.* **125**, 150 (1983).
- [14] H. J. von Soldner, Ueber die Ablenkung eines Lichtstrahls von seiner geradlinigen Bewegung, durch die Attraktion eines Weltkörpers, an welchem er nahe vorbei geht, *Berliner Astronomisches Jahrbuch*, 161 (1804).
- [15] A. Einstein, Die Grundlage der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie, *Annalen der Physik* **354**, 769 (1916).
- [16] F. W. Dyson, A. S. Eddington, and C. Davidson, IX. A determination of the deflection of light by the sun's gravitational field, from observations made at the total eclipse of May 29, 1919, *Philos. T. R. Soc. S-A* **220**, 291 (1920).
- [17] H. von Klüber, The determination of Einstein's light-deflection in the gravitational field of the sun, *Vistas Astron.* **3**, 47 (1960).
- [18] R. D. Reasenberg, I. I. Shapiro, P. E. MacNeil, R. B. Goldstein, J. C. Breidenthal, J. P. Brenkle, D. L. Cain, T. M. Kaufman, T. A. Komarek, and A. I. Zygielbaum,

- Viking relativity experiment - Verification of signal retardation by solar gravity, *Astrophys. J.* **234**, L219 (1979).
- [19] S. S. Shapiro, J. L. Davis, D. E. Lebach, and J. S. Gregory, Measurement of the Solar Gravitational Deflection of Radio Waves using Geodetic Very-Long-Baseline Interferometry Data, 1979–1999, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 121101 (2004).
- [20] B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, M. R. Abernathy, F. Acernese, K. Ackley, C. Adams, T. Adams, P. Addesso, R. X. Adhikari, *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016).
- [21] B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, F. Acernese, K. Ackley, C. Adams, T. Adams, P. Addesso, R. X. Adhikari, V. B. Adya, *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), GW170817: Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Neutron Star Inspiral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 161101 (2017).
- [22] K. Akiyama, R. Azulay, A.-K. Baczkó, M. Balokovi, J. Barrett, L. Blackburn, K. L. Bouman, G. C. Bower, C. D. Brinkerink, *et al.* (The Event Horizon Telescope Collaboration), First M87 Event Horizon Telescope Results. I. the Shadow of the Supermassive Black Hole, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **875**, 17 (2019).
- [23] S. Weinberg, The cosmological constant problem, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **61**, 1 (1989).
- [24] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, and J. Silk, Particle dark matter: Evidence, candidates and constraints, *Phys. Rep.* **405**, 279 (2005).
- [25] J. A. Frieman, M. S. Turner, and D. Huterer, Dark energy and the accelerating universe, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **46**, 385 (2008).
- [26] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Mach's Principle and a Relativistic Theory of Gravitation, *Phys. Rev.* **124**, 925 (1961).
- [27] J. Khoury and A. Weltman, Chameleon Fields: Awaiting Surprises for Tests of Gravity in Space, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 171104 (2004).
- [28] C. M. Will, *Theory and experiment in gravitational physics* (Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- [29] M. Tegmark, M. A. Strauss, M. R. Blanton, K. Abazajian, S. Dodelson, H. Sandvik, X. Wang, D. H. Weinberg, I. Zehavi, N. A. Bahcall, *et al.*, Cosmological parameters from SDSS and WMAP, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 103501 (2004).
- [30] E. Komatsu, K. M. Smith, J. Dunkley, C. L. Bennett, B. Gold, G. Hinshaw, N. Jarosik, D. Larson, M. R. Nolta, L. Page, *et al.*, Seven-year Wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe (WMAP) observations: Cosmological interpretation, *Astrophys. J. Suppl. S.* **192**, 18 (2011).
- [31] P. A. R. Ade, N. Aghanim, C. Armitage-Caplan, M. Arnaud, M. Ashdown, F. Atrio-Barandela, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), Planck 2013 results. XVI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **571**, A16 (2014).
- [32] P. A. R. Ade, N. Aghanim, M. Arnaud, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, A. J. Banday, R. Barreiro, J. G. Bartlett, N. Bartolo, *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), Planck 2015 results-XIII. cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A13 (2016).
- [33] M. Tanabashi, K. Hagiwara, K. Hikasa, K. Nakamura, Y. Sumino, F. Takahashi, J. Tanaka, K. Agashe, G. Aielli, C. Amsler, *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Review of particle physics, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 030001 (2018).
- [34] P. W. Higgs, Broken Symmetries and the Masses of Gauge Bosons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **13**, 508 (1964).
- [35] S. Dürr, Z. Fodor, J. Frison, C. Hoelbling, R. Hoffmann, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, T. Kurth, L. Lellouch, T. Lippert, *et al.*, Ab initio determination of light hadron masses, *Science* **322**, 1224 (2008).
- [36] S. Borsanyi, S. Durr, Z. Fodor, C. Hoelbling, S. D. Katz, S. Krieg, L. Lellouch, T. Lippert, A. Portelli, K. K. Szabo, *et al.*, Ab initio calculation of the neutron-proton mass difference, *Science* **347**, 1452 (2015).
- [37] S. Aoki, Y. Aoki, D. Bećirević, C. Bernard, T. Blum, G. Colangelo, M. Della Morte, P. Dimopoulos, S. Dürr, H. Fukaya, *et al.*, Review of lattice results concerning low-energy particle physics, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 112 (2017).
- [38] Y.-B. Yang, J. Liang, Y.-J. Bi, Y. Chen, T. Draper, K.-F. Liu, and Z. Liu, Proton Mass Decomposition from the QCD Energy Momentum Tensor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 212001 (2018).
- [39] P. W. Anderson, Plasmons, Gauge Invariance, and Mass, *Phys. Rev.* **130**, 439 (1963).
- [40] Y. Shi, N. J. Fisch, and H. Qin, Effective-action approach to wave propagation in scalar QED plasmas, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 012124 (2016).
- [41] A. S. Eddington, *Space, time and gravitation: an outline of the general relativity theory* (Cambridge university press, 1920).
- [42] H. Weyl, Gravitation and electricity, *Sitzungsber. Königl. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.* **26**, 465 (1918).
- [43] G. Nordström, Zur theorie der gravitation vom standpunkt des relativitätsprinzips, *Annalen der Physik* **42**, 533 (1913).
- [44] W.-T. Ni, Yang's gravitational field equations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 319 (1975).
- [45] C. N. Yang, Integral formalism for gauge fields, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33**, 445 (1974).
- [46] E. L. Hill, On the Kinematics of Uniformly Accelerated Motions and Classical Electromagnetic Theory, *Phys. Rev.* **72**, 143 (1947).
- [47] F. Rohrlich, The principle of equivalence, *Ann. Phys.* **22**, 169 (1963).
- [48] N. Poli, F.-Y. Wang, M. G. Tarallo, A. Alberti, M. Prevedelli, and G. M. Tino, Precision Measurement of Gravity with Cold Atoms in an Optical Lattice and Comparison with a Classical Gravimeter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 038501 (2011).
- [49] J. G. Williams, S. G. Turyshev, and D. H. Boggs, Progress in lunar laser ranging tests of relativistic gravity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 261101 (2004).
- [50] S. Schlamminger, K.-Y. Choi, T. A. Wagner, J. H. Gundlach, and E. G. Adelberger, Test of the Equivalence Principle Using a Rotating Torsion Balance, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 041101 (2008).
- [51] P. Touboul, G. Métris, M. Rodrigues, Y. André, Q. Baghi, J. Bergé, D. Boulanger, S. Bremer, P. Carle, R. Chhun, *et al.*, MICROSCOPE mission: first results of a space test of the equivalence principle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 231101 (2017).
- [52] R. Colella, A. W. Overhauser, and S. A. Werner, Observation of Gravitationally Induced Quantum Interference, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 1472 (1975).
- [53] M. Kasevich and S. Chu, Measurement of the gravitational acceleration of an atom with a light-pulse atom interferometer, *Appl. Phys. B* **54**, 321 (1992).

- [54] A. Peters, K. Y. Chung, and S. Chu, Measurement of gravitational acceleration by dropping atoms, *Nature* **400**, 849 (1999).
- [55] G. S. Shostak, Aperture synthesis study of H I in the galaxy IC 10, *Astron. Astrophys.* **31**, 97 (1974).
- [56] R. J. Cohen, The unusual kinematics of the galaxy IC 10, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **187**, 839 (1979).
- [57] J. E. Baldwin, D. Lynden-Bell, and R. Sancisi, Lopsided galaxies, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **193**, 313 (1980).
- [58] A. Bosma, 21-cm line studies of spiral galaxies. I. Observations of the galaxies NGC 5033, 3198, 5055, 2841, and 7331., *Astron. J.* **86**, 1791 (1981).
- [59] O.-G. Richter and R. Sancisi, Asymmetries in disk galaxies. How often? How strong?, *Astron. Astrophys.* **290**, L9 (1994).
- [60] V. C. Rubin, A. H. Waterman, and J. D. P. Kenney, Kinematic Disturbances in Optical Rotation Curves among 89 Virgo Disk Galaxies, *Astrophys. J.* **118**, 236 (1999).
- [61] Bournaud, F., Combes, F., Jog, C. J., and Puerari, I., Lopsided spiral galaxies: evidence for gas accretion, *Astron. Astrophys.* **438**, 507 (2005).
- [62] C. J. Jog and F. Combes, Lopsided spiral galaxies, *Phys. Rep.* **471**, 75 (2009).
- [63] J. van Eymeren, E. Jütte, C. Jog, Y. Stein, and R.-J. Dettmar, Lopsidedness in WHISP galaxies-I. Rotation curves and kinematic lopsidedness, *Astron. Astrophys.* **530**, A29 (2011).
- [64] D. R. Andersen and M. A. Bershad, The photometric and kinematic structure of face-on disk galaxies. III. kinematic inclinations from H α velocity fields, *Astrophys. J.* **768**, 41 (2013).